Application No. 10/034,277 Paper filed January 29, 2007 Reply to Office Action mailed September 27, 2006 Attorney Docket No. P215/US Page 12 of 14

REMARKS

Status Summary

Claims 1-4, 7-19, 22-34 and 36-43 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 16 and 31 are presented in independent form. Claims 1-4, 7-19, 22-34 and 36-43 stand rejected. Claims 1, 16, and 31 are amended herein.

Claim Rejection(s) - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-4, 7-19, 22-34 and 36-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Amended claims 1, 16, and 31 are fully supported by the application as filed. The application as filed contains multiple sections discussing form-driven user interfaces. For example, the section of the specification from the application as filed beginning on page 17 lines 6-18 reads:

After merging vocabularies 84, the Web application 50 builds the user interface by generating forms for metadata assignment in step 306 through which the user may enter values for the assigned metadata. In a preferred embodiment, the interface is a series of one or more forms displayed in the web browser 19. In a preferred embodiment, XSLT is used to transform the RDF schema specification into XHTML forms for display in the user's web browser 19. The user 18 is then allowed to navigate through the form(s) entering data in step 308. The forms may display additional comments provided by the vocabularies 84 to aid the user 18 in entering the data values. As the user moves to an input field for a given property, the Web application 50 uses the constraints defined for the property to determine the correct form element to use for data input for any given property (a test field, a selection list, a choice list, and so on).

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that amended claims 1, 16, and 31 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph. Claims 2-15, 17-30, and 32-43 depend on the above referenced claims and also meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph.

Application No. 10/034,277 Paper filed January 29, 2007 Reply to Office Action mailed September 27, 2006

Claims 1-4, 7-19, 22-34 and 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Office Actions states:

Claim 1, recites "providing form information to a client computer for presenting a form-driven user interface that allows the user to specify, without using syntax required by an underlying specification language, a plurality of properties, including constraints supported by the underlying specification, thereby define a custom metadata schema". Applicant should duly note that the step to achieve the defined custom metadata schema is given. However, such a customized metadata schemas is not yet defined. Applicant is advised to amend the claims to define such custom metadata schemas set forth in the claims.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants assume the Examiner is referring to a "custom metadata schema" as metadata schemas are well known in the prior art. For example, a Google search will provide numerous Metadata Schemas, including the NLM Metadata Schema can be found at the following URL: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/tsd/cataloging/metafilenew.html.

The independent claims of the instant application refer to a custom metadata schema. A custom metadata schema is a metadata schema that includes metadata properties including constraints specified by a user without using syntax required by an underlying specification language. The specification of the application as filed includes a section on page 8, lines 11-17 that reads as follows:

All images 20 in the system 10 are required to have associated with them metadata 22 specified by the universal schema. Each schema or vocabulary 84 specifies the metadata properties in that vocabulary and specifies constraints that must be enforced in order to comply with the vocabulary. The present invention allows users 18 and groups to define their own schemas, which may include the universal schema and may borrow from other vocabularies 84.

Application No. 10/034,277 Attorney Docket No. P215/US
Paper filed January 29, 2007 Page 14 of 14

Reply to Office Action mailed September 27, 2006

Applicants respectfully assert that a custom metadata schema is clearly defined in the claims and the specification as filed. As such applicants respectfully assert that amended claims 1, 16, and 31 meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph. Claims 2-15, 17-30, and 32-43 depend on the above referenced claims and also meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney at the below-listed number if, after reviewing the above Remarks, the Examiner believes outstanding matters remain that may be resolved without the issuance of a subsequent Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment, associated with the filling of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-3512.

Respectfully submitted.

Date: January 29, 2007 By: /John A. Demos/

John A. Demos Registration No. 52.809

Customer No: **49278**111 Corning Road; Ste. 220
Cary, North Carolina 27518
919 233 1942 x219 (voice)
919 233 9907 (fax)